

building. It is a selected group of people. The facilities are available and used in many original ways, as I have learned.

I remember not so many months ago when I was coming into the building, I had to fight my way in the main door. I was coming in at a time when the lawyers of Canada were leaving the building after having what might be called a mammoth reception. We would not call it a bash. It was just a reception. However, there were many people, probably including some members who are here, who participated in that reception for the legal profession. Is it argued now that the ordinary people of Canada should not have access to the building?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: Is it to be argued that it is possible for members of the professions, such as lawyers, to come into the building, but the foot soldiers, as they were so eloquently described by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey), should not be permitted? I do not think anyone would agree to that. However, I just want to mention these things so that this can be put into perspective. Those on the other side who do not recollect these events must have had a better time than I expected.

● (1522)

On this present particular issue, it is true that availability for functions has been explored with Mr. Speaker by officials of the National Liberal Federation and members of parliament. No final decision has been made, but I want to make this perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker: you have laid down guidelines; you are the protector of the dignity of parliament.

Mr. Paproski: Lock the doors!

Mr. MacEachen: We are ready to accept whatever decision you may make. We shall support it 100 per cent, and we on this side will observe any guidelines which you propose to ensure that horrendous security problems will be looked after, and to ensure that members of parliament who are going to work in the West Block on Friday night at eleven o'clock will have privacy and quiet.

Furthermore, in the interest of amity and in the interest of the requirements of the Canadian political system I am prepared, as House leader for the government, to consult with the Speaker, to consult with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), to consult with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and with my colleague in the Social Credit party on this subject if that would help. We quite realize that the Liberal party will flourish even if it does not hold a reception in these buildings.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join briefly in this discussion. The Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) said that the argumentation in connection with this motion earlier in the day was derived from quotations attributed to

Privilege—Hon. M. Lambert

certain anonymous Liberal organizers—he implied that this was not a very reliable source. I want the hon. gentleman to know that any Liberal organizer in the country today, if he is an organizer, sure as hell wants to remain anonymous!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: I want to get to the substance of the issue. The Deputy Prime Minister has tried to dismiss this question as one which has been raised in connection with a function which is entirely analogous to other functions which take place in the House of Commons. I submit that the argument he put forward rests on such an assumption. I further submit that the argument is completely fallacious.

In my experience there are only two other functions of comparable magnitude which take place in parliament, gatherings which are large in scale and festive in nature. They are Your Honour's annual function and the press gallery annual dinner. I would point out that there are unique features attached to those functions. First, they are non-partisan, in the sense that they are not associated with any of the political parties—in one case they are associated with Your Honour, and in the other we have a get-together of representatives of the press and old associates, along with members of parliament, for an annual bash—

Mr. MacEachen: It is the size that is important.

Mr. Broadbent: I submit that an annual, frivolous, good-natured function of that kind is in order precisely because it is not restricted to any one party and because it is very limited in terms of the frequency of its occurrence. I am talking about two functions, Your Honour's and the press gallery dinner. I think it is important that the social aspect of parliament be restricted so that we do not find ourselves in a pattern of associating the House of Commons with frivolous, good-natured parties which are, to a considerable extent, subsidized by the people of Canada. Particularly, I submit, this should not be the case when functions are organized on a partisan basis. In my view, neither my own party nor the Liberal party nor the Conservative party should, in the first place, submit a proposal to hold such a bash here. Having been submitted, on the basis of bad judgment, it should not be accepted.

It is appropriate for any of the parties to use the facilities here on a limited basis for a conference or for a serious meeting, but to use these facilities as an extension of a national convention is a serious mistake and would put in jeopardy the esteem, to the extent it still exists, which the people of Canada have for parliament and its members. If we get into the habit of using this building for regular bashes organized by each of our political parties at the expense, in good measure, of Canadians generally—

An hon. Member: Ah!

Mr. Broadbent: Some members opposite say "Ah!". I hope they will reconsider this proposal.

An hon. Member: Quack, quack!